

CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY  
San Luis Obispo, California  
ACADEMIC SENATE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - MINUTES  
Tuesday: October 28, 1986  
UU 220 3:00 p.m.

Chair: Lloyd H. Lamouria  
Vice Chair: Lynne E. Gamble  
Secretary: Raymond D. Terry

Members Absent: Weatherby

I. Preparatory

- A. The meeting was called to order at 3:10 p.m. upon achieving a quorum.
- B. The minutes of the October 14, 1986 Executive Committee meeting were approved as mailed.

II. Communications

- A. The Chair directed the Executive Committee's attention to the Resolution on Collective Bargaining, recently passed by the Academic Senate at Sacramento. He asked the Executive Committee to advise him as to the need for a similar resolution to be introduced in the Cal Poly Academic Senate.
- B. Ray Terry and Lynne Gamble each spoke in favor of preparing and adopting a similarly-worded resolution, but to include it as part of the Senate's consent agenda to permit greater discussion time for more controversial items.
- C. By consensus, the Executive Committee agreed to include a Resolution on Collective Bargaining on the consent agenda of the November 4, 1986 Academic Senate meeting.

III. Reports

A. Academic Affairs Office

- 1. Malcolm Wilson reported that he, Frank Lebens, Jim Conway and Harvey Greenwald had met to reconcile conflicting ideas concerning the proposed budget process. A revised draft will soon be returned to the Senate.

2. Malcolm Wilson further announced that the President's Advisory Committee on Budget Resources and Allocations was ready to report concerning the use of lottery funds.

B. Statewide Senators

There were no reports.

IV. Discussion Items

- A. The Chair informed the Executive Committee that Jim Conway had requested the Executive Committee's guidance concerning the use of lottery funds to pay for visiting lecturers. Specifically, he requested that the Executive Committee respond to the following three questions:

1. What impact should FTEF have on each school's base allocation?
2. Should priority be given to continuing programs?
3. What considerations should be given to university-wide versus intra-school impact in the funding of distinguished lecturers?

- B. Malcolm Wilson opened the discussion by speaking in favor of using a base for each school, followed by an evaluation (in a yet-to-be-determined manner) of what to add to the base.

1. He noted that the usual bias of considering more specific proposals to be better than vague ones may not be valid in this case since the list of speakers often remains incomplete until a program is about to begin.
2. He pointed out the difficulty of evaluating the small request of a large school relative to a large request by a small school.
3. He suggested the creation (for future years, not for this year) of a Speaker's Bureau to evaluate all requests.

C. Various opinions

1. Mike Botwin felt the Senate should not respond to the Conway request for direction.
2. Reg Gooden suggested that we authorize our representative (Jim Conway) to act as trustee and vote

his own conscience since the Executive Committee did not have time to analyze the problem adequately.

3. Tim Kersten urged the Executive Committee to respond to Jim Conways's questions. He further argued that FTEF should be the prime, but not the only, consideration in allocating funds.
  4. Lynne Gamble favored an equal division of funds among the schools if our decisions today were to be in effect for a number of years, but a more flexible distribution if the process were to be repeated annually.
  5. Susan Currier argued in favor of an equal distribution among the schools.
  6. Bill Forgeng insisted that the Departments should make the final decisions on the details of the programs. Charles Crabb expressed the same view in different words.
  7. Ken Riener supported the idea of withholding a portion of the budget for university-wide use.
- E. The following motion resulted from comments made by Susan Currier, Malcolm Wilson and others:

The Academic Senate Executive Committee recommends that for the 1986-1987 academic year there be an initial distribution of funds for commencement speakers and for professional growth and development; after this, the remaining available funds be distributed equally among the several schools, subject to faculty consultation (participation in the decision-making process) at the school level.

The motion passed by a vote of 7 Yes, 3 No.

#### V. Business Items

##### A. Resolution on Cooperative Education Classes

1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana (Chair: Curriculum Committee) who presented the background and rationale for the resolution.
2. Copies of a memo from Malcolm Wilson to Anthony J. Moye (Associate Vice Chancellor) were distributed in support of the Resolution.
3. Reg Gooden indicated his support for the Resolu-

tion. He voiced the need for the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education.

4. The Chair recognized Dianne Long (Pol. Sci.) who argued the need for a committee to set up guidelines by which academic credit could be earned for para-academic experiences.
5. Susan Currier wondered if the end result would be to establish the CoOp Office as an academic department. Mike Botwin felt that each department could should get credit for participation in the co-op program.
6. By consensus the Executive Committee agreed to send the Resolution on Cooperative Education forward to the Senate for a First Reading on Nov. 4, 1986.
7. The Executive Committee further authorized the Officers to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Experiential Education (with one representative to be selected from each of the seven schools and PCS, plus a representative from the Co-op Office.

#### B. Resolution on Free Electives

1. The Chair recognized Charles Dana (Chair: Curriculum Committee) who addressed the urgency of this issue in view of this being a catalog cycle year.
2. Mike Botwin favored bringing forth last year's Resolution on Free Electives. Bill Forgeng supported this approach. The Senate must reiterate its stand.
3. Lynne Gamble suggested that the President address this issue during one of the question-and-answer periods to take place this year.
4. Ken Riener argued that students have enough freedom to take courses of their own choice in meeting the GE&B requirements. GE&B proponents insisted that free electives are separate from GE&B requirements and should not confused with them.
5. Glenn Irvin spoke in favor of the Resolution and noted that many departments have designated which GE&B courses their students must take.
6. Lynne Gamble noted that nine units of free electives was such a small number that the justification process established by the Resolution was not worth the effort.

7. The Executive Committee agreed that the Resolution should be placed on the Senate's Nov. 4, 1986 agenda.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m..